

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 15 and 22-35 are pending in the current application. Claim 1 is an independent claim. By this Amendment, withdrawn claims 11-14 and 16-21 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 10 is amended to correct a minor informality. New claims 32-35 are added. No new matter has been added.

I. PRIORITY DOCUMENT

Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of receipt of the certified copy of the priority document from the International Bureau, a copy of which is available on the USPTO PAIR website.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for recitation of “for example” which allegedly renders the claim indefinite. As the claim is amended to remove the phrase, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 1-10, 15 and 22-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 08-236294 to Youzou in view of US Patent 6,893,533 to Holland, et al. (Holland). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of references fails to disclose or suggest, a high frequency power supplying device, having two or more loads which are capacitive or inductive, said high frequency power supplying device comprising high frequency power sources for supplying

power to the loads, each of the high frequency power sources being provided in proximity to a corresponding load.

It is alleged in the Office Action that Youzou discloses “two or more loads L which are inductive.” However, reference characters “L” in the figures of Youzou are not loads of a power supply device as claimed. Rather, reference characters “L” represent an inductance of a wiring line from a matching box 11, 13 15 to an electrode 5 housed in the chamber 5 (see Abstract and Fig. 2 of Youzou). Thus, Youzou fails to disclose the features as alleged in the Office Action.

Further, in rejecting the claims the Examiner relies on a foreign language reference having only an English language abstract. When relying on a foreign language document in support of a rejection, “if the document is in a language other than English and the Examiner seeks to rely on that document, a translation must be obtained so that the record is clear as to the precise facts the Examiner is relying upon in support of the rejection (MPEP §706.02). As the Examiner relies on more than the English language Abstract of Youzou in rejecting the claims and does not provide a translation, reliance on the reference is improper.

Moreover, Youzou relates to a high frequency plasma device that supplies high frequency power to a plasma generation electrode of a parallel plate capacitance coupling plasma reactor where high frequency powers are supplied from plural points onto the electrode. In Youzou, high frequency power having different phases is supplied to a single large plasma generation electrode such that the supplied power overlaps each other to address the non-uniformity caused by a standing wave. In contrast, in the device of the pending claims, no standing wave is formed on the load.

Holland relates to a plasma reactor having a symmetric parallel conductor coil antenna. Like Youzou, Holland also fails to disclose or suggest a device where no standing wave is

formed on the load. Thus, even were Youzou combined with Holland, the combination of references fails to render the pending claims obvious.

Regarding the rejection of dependent claims 3-10, 15 and 22-27, it is alleged, without documentary support, that all of the features would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of the invention. Rather, it is merely alleged that all of the additional features would have been obvious. As the Examiner has not taken *Official Notice*, or other wise indicated that the features are “common knowledge,” and the criteria for obviousness have not been met, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

IV. NEW CLAIMS

New claims 32-35 read on the elected Group I. Further the combination of applied references fail to disclose or suggest, that the proximity is such that a wiring length of the high frequency power source is set so as to avoid formation of a standing wave in each of the loads, as recited in claim 32, or a wiring length of each of the high frequency power sources is less than $\frac{1}{4}$ with respect to a wavelength of the high frequency, as recited in claim 33.

Moreover, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest that the loads are antennas, or that the antennas are independently driven and controlled such that a standing wave is avoided, as recited in new claims 34 and 35, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of each of the pending claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



John W. Fitzpatrick, Reg. No. 41,018

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/JWF